UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,092	11/30/2001	Wen-Yin Liu	MS1-933US	4350

22801 7590 03/09/2007

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER	
TRUONG, CAM Y T	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/09/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 03/09/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/998,092	LIU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cam Y T. Truong	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 February 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *24-28,31,32 and 87-100* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *24-28, 31-32, 87-100* _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/23/07
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 24-28, 31-32, 87-100 are pending in this Office action.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 24-28, 31-32, 87-100 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 24, 87 and 94 are objected to because of the following informalities: The phrase "context previous to" should be written as "context previous" in claim 24, line 20; claim 87, line 19; claim 94, line 21. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 24, 25, 28, 87-88, 91, 94-95 and 98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy in view of Dunning et al (or hereinafter "Dunning") (US 2003/0229537) and Schuetze et al (or hereinafter "Schuetze") (US 6564202).

As to claim 24, Liddy teaches the claimed limitations:

"detecting user input corresponding to a present user context" as (col. 2, lines 48-63; col. 8, lines 1-10);

independent of whether the user input is associated with an explicitly query; analyzing at least a subset of the user input in view of semantic text and user intention, the semantic text comprising the at least a subset and previously collected text from a personal media database customized for the user, the previously collected text being semantically related to one or more previous multimedia accesses by the users (the system also provides the system's interpretation of which terms in the query are deemed to be mandatory and solicits user input. One the user has modified the system's interpretation of the query, the user invokes the matcher which executed the query against the database. One the documents has retrieved and placed in folders, the user is given a change to modify the retrieval and document display criteria. The system provides techniques for generating sophisticated representations of the contents of both queries and documents in a retrieval system by using natural lingual to represent retrieval texts at the multiple levels e.g., semantic, lexical and syntactic (col. 2, lines 35-45; col. 28, lines 15-30);

"the analyzing further comprising evaluating the user input based on lexical and syntactical features" as (syntactic (col. 2, lines 35-45; col. 28, lines 15-30);

"predicting desired access to one or more media files based on the analysis" as (col. 28, lines1-40);

"retrieving information corresponding to one or more files from a media content source, wherein the retrieved information generated in response to a user context previous to and different from the present user context" as (col. 28, lines 30-40; figs. 16-17).

Liddy does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "user references modeling, the user preferences modeling containing user log records clustered into several preferences clusters based on cluster semantic similarity, each clusters of the clusters represented by a keyword frequency vector".

Dunning teaches electronic commerce sites are able to suggest products and services that are likely to be of interest to particular users, based on user profiles and preferences which contains user log records(paragraph [0005; 0044]).

Schuetze teaches representing users in a user population, quantitatively determining similarity between users, clustering users according to those similarities, and visually representing clusters of users by analogy to clusters of documents. Each cluster is represented as a vector (abstract, col. 30, lines 15-23; col. 12, lines 15-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Schuetze's teaching of representing users in a user population, quantitatively determining similarity between users, clustering users according to those similarities, and visually representing clusters of users by analogy to clusters of documents. Each cluster is represented as a vector and Dunning's teaching of electronic commerce sites are able to suggest products and services that are likely to be of interest to particular users, based on user profiles and preferences which contains user log records to Liddy's system in order to enhance browsing, searching, retrieving and recommending content in a collection of documents correctly corresponding user's query and further to facilitate generation of recommendations that are likely to be of interest to the user, and leads to improved

marketing and ad targeting, along with greater credibility and utility of the recommendation system.

As to claims 25, 88 and 95, Liddy teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the input is text" as (fig. 11).

As to claims 28, 91 and 98, Liddy teaches the claimed limitations:

"wherein analyzing the user input further comprises determining one or more keywords from text" as (col. 2, lines 48-63);

"evaluating the one or more keywords in view of semantic text and user intention and preference patterns, the semantic text comprising previously collected text from a personal media database customized to the user" as provides the system's interpretation of which terms in the query are deemed to be mandatory and solicits user input. One the user has modified the system's interpretation of the query, the user invokes the matcher which executed the query against the database. One the documents has retrieved and placed in folders, the user is given an opportinuity to modify the retrieval and document display criteria. The system provides techniques for generating sophisticated representations of the contents of both queries and documents in a retrieval system by using natural lingual to represent retrieval texts at the multiple levels e.g., semantic, lexical and syntactic (col. 2, lines 35-45; col. 28, lines 15-30).

Claims 87 and 94 are rejected under the same reason as discussed in claim 24.

6. Claims 26, 89, 96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy in view of of Dunning et al (or hereinafter "Dunning") (US 2003/0229537) and Schuetze et al (or hereinafter "Schuetze") (US 6564202) and further in view of Talati (US 5999942).

As to claims 26, 89, 96, Liddy does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the user input is text in a word processor document or in an e-mail".

Talati teaches A user types in the query "switch to word processor and update the Appage.TM. page "word.veb"", APCS 13 switches to the Word Processor application, selects action update and loads the Appage.TM. page for the document word.web into the word processor attribute window (col. 15, lines 50-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Talati's teaching of a user types in the query "switch to word processor and update the Appage.TM. page "word.veb"", APCS 13 switches to the Word Processor application, selects action update and loads the Appage.TM. page for the document word.web into the word processor attribute window to Liddy's system in order to filter viruses or restrict documents containing offensive material by modifying activation actions within the EBCS without modifying Microsoft's Internet Browser.

7. Claims 27, 90 and 97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy in view of Dunning et al (or hereinafter "Dunning") (US 2003/0229537) and

Schuetze et al (or hereinafter "Schuetze") (US 6564202) and further in view of Balabanovic (6895552).

As to claims 27, 90 and 97, Liddy does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the information further comprises suggested media content items, the method further comprising; detecting user interest in an item of the suggested media items" as (fig. 11).

Liddy does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "responsive to detecting the user interest, displaying a high-level feature corresponding to the item, the high-level feature being stored in a database customized to the user". Balabanovic teaches method and apparatus for generating and displaying a visual summarization of a document is described. In one embodiment, a technique described herein extracts visual features from the document and ranks multiple pages of a document based upon at least one or more visual features of the page. The pages may be presented on a graphical user interface (GUI) to a user with features being displayed that are ranked higher (col. 2,lines 1-6).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Balabanovic's teaching of displaying ranked higher features of page to Liddy's system in order to o represent documents or other items such that information about a document or item is easily relayed to and understandable by a user.

8. Claims 31, 92 and 99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy in view of of Dunning et al (or hereinafter "Dunning") (US 2003/0229537) and Schuetze et al (or hereinafter "Schuetze") (US 6564202) and further in view of Conrad (US 5682539).

As to claims 31, 92 and 99, Liddy does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein analyzing the user input further comprises evaluating the user input based on at least a partially instantiated sentences pattern".

Conrad teaches user input sentence is received and a pattern is generated from the words of the input sentence. An algorithm stored in the computer is applied to select which one of the number of general meaning nodes is intended by the user by comparing the input sentence pattern to the typical sentence patterns (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Conrad's teaching of user input sentence is received and a pattern is generated from the words of the input sentence. An algorithm stored in the computer is applied to select which one of the number of general meaning nodes is intended by the user by comparing the input sentence pattern to the typical sentence patterns to Liddy's system in order to retrieve the most relevance document corresponding to user's query based on sentence patterns.

9. Claims 32, 93 and 100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy in view of of Dunning et al (or hereinafter "Dunning") (US

2003/0229537) and Schuetze et al (or hereinafter "Schuetze") (US 6564202) and further in view of Chong (US 6366908)

As to claims 32, 93 and 100, Liddy does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "identifying media content use patterns, and wherein analyzing the user input further comprises evaluating the user input based on the media content use patterns, wherein the suggested access is an insert or attach media content operation".

Chong teaches keyfact-based retrieval method, which extracts precise keyfact patterns included in a natural query of a user using the natural language processing techniques and retrieves documents similar to the query in the keyfact-based index file, is provided (col. 2, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Chong's teaching of keyfact-based retrieval method, which extracts precise keyfact patterns included in a natural query of a user using the natural language processing techniques and retrieves documents similar to the query in the keyfact-based index file, is provided to Liddy's system in order to retrieve the most relevance document corresponding to user's query based on sentence patterns.

Contact Information

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T. Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Firday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cam Y Truong
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2162
3/2/2007